DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 204 UD 034 026

AUTHOR	Dryfoos, Joy G.
TITLE	Evaluation of Community Schools: Findings to Date.
INSTITUTION	Coalition for Community Schools, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, NY.
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	27p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.communityschools.org.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *After School Programs; *Community Schools; Elementary Secondary Education; Nontraditional Education; Parent Participation; Partnerships in Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Student Behavior; Urban Education

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes data from evaluations of community school initiatives. Section 1 describes community schools, discusses the nature and limitations of existing research on effectiveness, and summarizes findings from 49 community school initiatives. This section also includes three examples of evaluations. All of the reports present findings on one or more outcomes, such as improved academic achievement, change in student behavior, or increased parental involvement. In 46 reports, some positive changes were noted, with 36 programs reporting academic gains, 11 programs reporting reductions in suspensions, 11 programs reporting reductions in problem behavior, 12 programs reporting increases in parent involvement, and 6 programs reporting lower violence rates. Section 2 offers research data on the 49 initiatives, presenting a brief overview of each model and outlining information currently available from research. It focuses on community schools and after-school programs. Within those two categories, the listings are presented at the national, state, and local levels. The listings range from multisite models to individual schools with unique programs. For each listing, contact information is included. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 450 204

EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY SCHOOLS: FINDINGS TO DATE

Joy G. Dryfoos

2000

COALITION FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Sheeran
Coalition for Community Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

UD034026

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

Part 1: Overview
- o What a Community School Looks Like
- o Research on Effectiveness
- o Sources of Information
- o Key Results
- o Social Behavior & Healthy Youth Development
- o Community Life
- o Comparison with Reform Movement

Part 2: Research
- o National models
- o State Initiatives
- o Local Initiatives - multiple schools
- o Local Initiatives - individual schools
- o After school programs

Back

Home

Coalition for Community Schools

Evaluation of Community Schools: findings to date

Joy G. Dryfoos
Hastings-on-Hudson
New York, 10706

This work has been conducted with support from the Carnegie Corporation but does not represent the views of the Corporation.

The purpose of this paper is to summarize data from available evaluations of community school initiatives. Part One provides a vision of community schools, discusses the nature and limitations of existing research, and offers a summary of findings from 49 community school initiatives. Three examples of evaluations are included in Part One in order to illustrate the scope of efforts underway. Part Two describes and offers research data on 49 different initiatives. It is our hope that the dissemination of this preliminary report will encourage others to come forward with documentation of their efforts and encourage a stronger emphasis on research and the collection of results data.

What a Community School Looks Like

The first question usually asked about community schools is "what are they?" and the second is "do they work?" 'Community school' is an inclusive term, encompassing a growing number of school-community initiatives that feature both common themes and differing approaches. The names of the initiatives suggest some of the varying attributes: Caring Communities, Beacons, Bridges to Success, University-Assisted Schools, Healthy Start, Communities in Schools, School of the 21st Century and many others. Some are broad in scope, promoting widespread replication or adaptation, while others are single entities. Programs are being initiated at the national level (e.g., Children's Aid Society, School of the 21st Century), state level (e.g., New Jersey School-Based Youth Program), local level (e.g., Polk Bros. Foundation Full Services Schools Initiative in Chicago) and in individual schools (Molly Stark Community School, Bennington, Vermont). Community schools also vary in their goals: Some specifically aim to improve academic achievement while others focus primarily on health and behavioral outcomes or enhanced family functioning.

Although the Coalition for Community Schools recognizes that each community school is unique, it has developed a general description of a well-developed community school:

Vision of a Community School

A community school, operating in a public school building, is open to students, families and the community before, during, and after school, seven days a week, all year long. It is jointly operated through a partnership between the school system and one or more community agencies. Families, youth, principals, teachers and neighborhood residents help design and implement activities that promote high educational achievement and positive youth development.

The school is oriented toward the community, encouraging student learning through community service and service learning. A before and after-school learning component encourages students to build on their classroom experiences, expand their horizons, contribute to their communities, and have fun. A family support center helps families with child rearing, employment, housing, immigration, and other services. Medical, dental, and mental health services are readily available. College faculty and students, business people, youth workers, neighbors, and family members come to support and bolster what schools are working hard to accomplish - ensuring young people's academic, interpersonal, and career success.

Ideally, a full-time community school coordinator works in partnership with the principal. This person is responsible for the delivery of an array of supports provided by local agency partners and participates on the management team for the school. Over time, most community schools consciously integrate activities in several areas to achieve the desired results: quality education; positive youth development; family support; family and community engagement in decision-making; and community development.

Research on effectiveness

Policy makers and practitioners want to know what kinds of positive changes community schools can make. Before addressing this question, we first ask, "Given our vision, what indicators of success should we be looking for?"

We believe that community schools should be seen as vehicles for education reform; therefore, improved learning and achievement must be a long-term measure of the effectiveness of this growing movement. In addition to test scores, learning and achievement related indicators include rates of attendance, promotion, graduation, suspension and expulsion for example.

It is important to note that community schools are designed to affect not only educational outcomes but other outcomes as well. Such outcomes include improved social behavior and healthy youth development; better family functioning and parental involvement; enhanced school and community climate; and access to support services. These outcomes have value in and of themselves, in addition to affecting educational outcomes.

The data summarized here indicate that community school initiatives are moving in the right direction across many different indicators of success, giving us cause for optimism. The story is not complete however. First, it should be noted that the programs we identified cover a broad continuum, from highly developed community schools that have been in existence for a decade or longer to schools that are just beginning to open their doors and offer expanded opportunities such as after-school activities. Second, the quality of the studies varied enormously, from evaluations that relied on very small non-representative samples to those that were based on carefully designed management information systems and control groups. At best, evaluation is difficult, expensive, and long-term. Only a few programs can produce what would pass as "scientific" results. Many others can offer "preliminary findings", early returns on long-term projects.

Limitations of the research must be understood. Even as we recognize some of the constraints we also must acknowledge the complexity of evaluation in a community schools context. Very few of the research studies summarized here used random assignment to define comparison groups. In the places that used comparison groups, these were either matched schools or non-participants. Randomized studies are extremely difficult, expensive, and time-consuming, and it is particularly challenging to identify "control groups." Many of the studies relied only on pre-post tests of participants, and then lost a substantial number of the students during the year or two that elapsed, in part due to family mobility. A few programs measured progress by achieving goals that may have been quite marginal. For example, one program had a goal that 40% of the students should improve their grade point average in a year. Reports of evaluations sometimes were only limited to positive results. Others presented tables of findings when it was clear that no effects were observed. In sum, these reports are preliminary and inconclusive, but the volume is impressive.

All around the country, researchers are struggling to do a better job of documenting the effects of these efforts. The constraints are many when one is trying to track events in an innovative multi-faceted program housed in a setting like a school where it is often difficult to conduct surveys. Researchers experience barriers to obtaining permission from families to survey their children and resistance from parents to filling out surveys. The students in disadvantaged schools have extremely high rates of mobility; half of the study population has left at the end of a year. School personnel often do not want to be bothered with filling out surveys and may not be invested in the findings. Staff may not know how to use

the research findings for program improvement. In addition, funders often press for results too early in the process.

Perhaps we should listen more to Lisbeth Schorr and Daniel Yankelovich, who have argued eloquently for moving ahead with social programs and not getting bogged down in methodological warfare. "Evaluating complex social programs is not like testing a new drug. The interventions needed to rescue inner-city schools, strengthen families, and rebuild neighborhoods are not stable chemicals manufactured and administered in standardized doses. Promising social programs are sprawling efforts with multiple components requiring constant mid-course corrections, the active involvement of committed human beings and flexible adaptation to local circumstances." As you browse through the examples presented below, you will see just how "sprawling" this emerging community school field is and how difficult it is to capture all that is happening.

What is most important is that there is a growing body of evidence that community schools are beginning to demonstrate positive effects on students, families, and communities. The preliminary data summarized here suggest that many of these models have the capacity to produce multiple impacts that include, and go beyond the expectations of traditional education reform.

Sources of Information

This is a first cut at compiling documentation on the impact of community schools. Many evaluations are currently underway, and within the next several years we should have access to much more information. An examination of citations in this paper will confirm that the "literature" about community schools is mostly "hidden". Compiling the information involves extracting annual reports and unpublished documents from researchers and program administrators throughout the country. Web sites (identified where known) are a great benefit because one can download reports that are difficult to obtain in hard copy and have not been (and probably never will be) published.

We were able to obtain information on 49 school-community programs that have produced recent evaluation reports or data on results. No two initiatives are alike nor are the research protocols used. Of the 49, six are after-school initiatives such as LA's Best. Some research reports, for example on the large-scale California Healthy Start Initiative, aggregate findings for hundreds of schools. Other programs, such as Communities in Schools, have submitted reports at state, community, and local site levels (counted as one report). Other evaluation efforts focus exclusively on one school such as the study of the Broad Acres Elementary Linkages to Learning School in Montgomery County, Maryland. Thus, the count of reports is rough and is intended to serve as an estimate of the large quantity of information that is becoming available.

All of the reports present findings on one or more outcomes, such as improved academic achievement, change in student behavior, or increased parental involvement. In 46 of the reports some positive changes were noted. In three of the reports, no positive changes were reported - that is, students in the schools with the programs did no better than those in comparison schools, or alternatively, students in the program did not improve their performances or behaviors over time.

Key Results

Highlights of the compilation on outcomes are presented below. The outcomes are organized into four major categories which reflect the comprehensiveness of community schools: learning and achievement, improved social behavior and healthy youth development; better family functioning and parental involvement; and, enhanced community life. Specific indicators are set forth for each outcome.

Learning and Achievement

Achievement : Thirty-six of the 49 programs reported academic gains. These gains generally included improvements in reading and math test scores, looked at over a two- or three-year period. Many of the programs reporting academic gains were in elementary schools. In at least eight of the cases, the outcomes were not schoolwide. Rather, they were limited to students who received special services, such as case management, intensive mental health services, or extended day sessions.

However, there were some instances of school-wide improvements on academic measures:

- Charles Drew Elementary School, a participating school in University of Pennsylvania's West Philadelphia Improvement Corp program, showed more improvement on the state's standardized reading and math tests than any other school in the state in 1999, an increase of 420 points.
- At PS 5, a Children's Aid Society Community School in New York City, the percentage of children reading at grade level rose from 28% when they were in grade 4 to 42% by the time they reached grade 6.

Attendance : Nineteen programs reported improvements in school attendance. Several reported lower dropout rates, one specifically among pregnant and parenting teens. Several mentioned higher teacher attendance rates, suggesting higher

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

levels of satisfaction. Examples of positive results in this area:

- A national evaluation of Communities in Schools found that about 70% of students with high absenteeism prior to participation in CIS improved their attendance.
- At Lane Middle School, a Schools Uniting Neighborhoods sites in Portland OR, attendance increased from 85% to 91% over two years.

Suspensions : Eleven programs reported a reduction in suspensions. This may reflect changes in suspension policies, rather than changes in behaviors leading to suspensions. As schools transform into more child-centered institutions, they are likely to change practices regarding suspensions and expulsions as part of the change in school climate.

- At the Woodrow Wilson Middle School in Des Moines, Iowa the rate of suspensions in 1995 was one-sixth the rate five years earlier.
- At Lane Middle School in Portland, OR, suspensions declined from 50 to 15 over two years.

Social Behavior and Healthy Youth Development

High-risk behaviors: Eleven programs reported reductions in rates of substance abuse, teen pregnancy, disruptive behavior in the classroom, or improvement in behavior in general. For example:

- An evaluation based on 138 grantees in California's Healthy Start initiative found that students receiving Healthy Start services decreased their drug use.
- The Blenheim School (Missouri Caring Communities site) reported a 40% decrease in disruptive behavioral incidents following the initiative of a system for referrals for clinical therapy.

Family Well-Being

Parent involvement. At least 12 of the programs reported increases in parent involvement. For example, at the Bryant School, a Caring Communities site in Missouri with an intensive family intervention program, volunteer hours increased from 43 in 1996 to 2,008 in 1998.

Family functioning. In many programs with a strong family focus, improved family functioning was reported.

- Parents who received School of the 21st Century services were able to improve their child development practices, were less stressed, spent less money on child care, and missed fewer days work.
- An evaluation of 138 grantees of California's Healthy Start initiative found that families reported improvement in filling basic needs such as housing, food and clothing, transportation, finances and employment.

Community Life

Access to services: Better access to health care, lower hospitalization rates, higher immunization rates, or access to dental care were reported at least once. After-school programs cited access to child care as a significant outcome.

- As a result of putting full time school nurses in school sites in the Success Program in Des Moines Public Schools, 97% of the children were immunized. Dental screenings produced a 34% increase in improved oral hygiene and a 36% decrease in referrals for cavities.
- At Broad Acres Elementary School in Montgomery County (MD), a Linkages to Learning site, access to health care was greatly increased, reducing the percent of families who reported no health care access for their children from 53% to 10%, and those with no insurance coverage from 38% to 10%.

Neighborhood: Six programs reported lower violence rates and safer streets in their communities. A unique finding was the reduction in student mobility reported by the Polk Bros. Foundation Full Service School Initiative:

- While mobility patterns varied, average mobility declined from 1996 to 1999 at all three schools participating in the initiative to levels at or below the city-wide average. More children are in school for longer periods, creating more chances to learn and participate in programs.

It should be noted that most of the programs showed impacts on more than one outcome, reflecting both the design and comprehensiveness of the research and the program. For example, the Marshalltown, Iowa, Caring Connection program appeared to have impacts on both academic achievement and youth development. Children's Aid Society had an impact on

school performance as well as parent involvement and community safety. Elizabeth Street in Los Angeles also improved school performance, lowered the dropout rate and brought parents into the school.

It is time for community schools to be recognized as an important component of the education reform movement. Most of these programs have goals not only to improve school performance, but also to change the lives of children and their families and reduce social barriers to learning. These initiatives recognize that the forces for upgrading the quality of education must be joined with the provision of strong supports.

Comparison with School Reform Movement

Community school providers may take some solace in the fact that few school reform models have been able to produce solid evidence of success. A recent publication, *An Educators' Guide to School Reform* , reviews research on 24 "whole-school," "comprehensive," or "school wide" approaches.[1] The concept of school wide reform clearly overlaps with community schools, and among the 24 models cited in the Guide, at least one appears here (School Development Program). This work was conducted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) under contract with the major educational organizations.

Each of the 24 models is rated on Evidence of Positive Effects on Student Achievement, using a five-point scale that ranges from strong evidence of positive effects (4 or more studies showing impact on educational achievement) to a no research rating, indicating that no rigorous studies were available. Only 3 of the school reform models were rated strong, 5 promising, 6 marginal, 1 weak, and 8 had no research at all. The Guide stated, "In general, evidence of positive effects on student achievement - arguably the most important feature of any reform approach - is extremely limited. Even though many of the approaches have been in schools for years, only three provide strong evidence of positive effects on student achievement. As a result, educators often are considering schoolwide reform without vital information on which to make decisions. More rigorous evaluations are needed with broad dissemination of findings."

PART TWO: RESEARCH ON INITIATIVES

This part describes the 49 initiatives analyzed in this report. A brief overview of each model is presented and outlines whatever information is currently available from research. Only the research is cited. Information about the models is available on request[3] and methodological descriptions of the major evaluations will be forthcoming.[4] This part is organized in two sections: Community Schools and After-School Programs. Within those categories, the listings are presented at the National, State, and Local levels, ranging from models that are being replicated across the country in many sites to individual schools that have unique programs.

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

National Models

These community school programs have been developed by community-based agencies, city youth bureaus, national organizations, or university groups. They have been replicated or adapted in many community schools throughout the nation. Most have technical assistance capacities and can respond to requests from local groups for help in planning and implementing programs. Information is provided for the basic model and other sites, where available.

Children's Aid Society Community Schools, New York

In 1990, the Children's Aid Society (CAS) of New York entered into a partnership with the local School District #6 to develop community schools.[5] CAS's approach to community schools is to provide a "seamless" learning and developmental experience for children, families, and communities. CAS began with two initial sites, Intermediate School 218 and Elementary School 5, and has also developed eight additional community schools locally and worked with a wide variety of public schools, community-based organizations and funders to help sites around the country.

The two initial sites, IS 218 and ES 5, have been the subject of a six-year process and outcome evaluation conducted by researchers from Fordham University. Both schools offer Family Resource Centers, medical and dental services, and extended hours of operation. School-supported and CAS-supported social workers and mental health counselors work together to serve students and families.

A three-year evaluation report of both schools was issued in 1999 by Anthony Cancelli and colleagues from Fordham University, contrasting the CAS schools with matched schools in the neighborhood.[6] Three sets of outcomes were examined: psycho-social, parent involvement and academic for students in grades 3 and 6 when the research started. The

research concluded that seven years after the establishment of the community schools, many of the goals had been reached. In regard to psychosocial development, the students had more positive attitudes toward school experiences. The buildings were full of people throughout the day and evening, engaged in a wide array of activities. Children were receiving high-quality medical and dental care, and had access to on-site mental health services. Parents were involved in the schools and felt a strong sense of responsibility for their children's education, particularly new immigrants.

Academic achievement over the years improved in both sites, although the rate of increase leveled off or decreased after the initial major gains were recorded. At PS 5, the percentage of children reading at grade level rose from 28% when they were in grade 4 to 42% by the time they reached grade 6. The same cohort math scores moved from 43% at grade level in grade 4 up to 50% by grade 6. The progress matched the improvement rate at comparison schools although the PS 5 children had lower scores at baseline. The researchers also found a significant positive correlation between attendance at extended day programs and reading scores. At IS 218, the research team found a clear pattern of steady though less dramatic improvement over time. Some 39% of students performed at grade level in reading at grade 6, rising to 45% by the time they were in grade 8. For math, the levels went from 49% to 52%.

The researchers observed that as the program matured, new challenges were arising regarding the logistics of managing growth such as setting up information systems that could track all the traffic, getting teachers to "buy in" to the concept, day to day challenges such as negotiating the competition for space and firming up the relationship between classroom instruction and extended day programs, and translating the programs and services into demonstrable improvement in academic outcomes.

The Children's Aid Society maintains a Technical Assistance Center for Community Schools in New York.

Contact: Jane Quinn, 212-949-4954, http://www.childrensaidsociety.org

Gardner School, Boston (CAS Adaptation Site)

The Gardner Elementary School, developed through a partnership with Boston College, the YMCA, and the local community, is an extended service school committed to providing before and after school programs for children in addition to economic, health, and education services to adults. It is an adaptation site for the CAS model. A Health center is staffed by St. Elizabeth's Medical Center, dental care by Joseph Smith Health Center, and mental health care by Allston Brighton Mental Health Clinic. Dozens of students and faculty members from Boston College provide tutoring and work on curriculum issues and social work interns provide counseling. A Parents' Center hosts workshops of topics such as immigration, staffed by law students and organizes evening classes.

Early results give evidence of improvements in academic performance, achievement, student engagement and satisfaction with school and attendance.[7] In 1999, Gardner was the eighth most improved elementary school in the state in literacy, based on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCA) results.

Contact: Tim Garvin, 617-782-3535

Stevenson-YMCA Community School Program, Long Beach, CA (CAS Adaptation Site)

The Stevenson Elementary School in collaboration with the local YMCA and the California State University Department of Social Work is a replication site for the CAS model. The goal of this community school is to enhance the academic, social and career development of youth through the active partnerships of youth, parents, school, and community resources in providing an array of school-site activities.

A preliminary evaluation collected data for a sample of the students comparing the semester previous to involvement at the end of the first year. First through third grade students showed significant progress in their academic achievement in the initial year of the program. The percentage of students who were considered below average declined from 49% to 30% while the students receiving above average grades went from 19% to 34%. Few changes were noted in work/study habits or personal growth. Fourth and fifth graders also significantly improved their effort, study habits, homework, and showed improved academic progress and attendance. The percentage of students with "above average" grades went from 15% to 30%. The evaluator observed, "These preliminary findings support the idea that the community school approach utilized here (extensive child and parent programming and integration of academic standards in extended day activities) may be a promising way to enhance academic achievement among students living in low income areas." However, as she points out, the lack of a control group precludes determining to what degree the community school model impacted the changes.

Contact: Noel Burcelis, Community School Coordinator, 562-495-1939

Evaluator: Julie O'Donnell, California State University, 652-985-7372

University-Assisted Schools, Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania (WEPIC)

Beginning in 1985, the University of Pennsylvania has sought to develop relationships with the surrounding community.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Currently, the University's Center for Community Partnerships works in collaboration with the West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC) and is actively involved in 13 local schools. These schools have a variety of activities during and after school hours, selected by school personnel in conjunction with university faculty and students. WEPIC's general approach calls for program-based, hands-on-learning focused on community improvement. Special areas of interest include health, the environment, nutrition, conflict resolution and peer mediation, desktop publishing, apprenticeships, entrepreneurial skills, and horticulture. Nearly 100 courses engage Penn faculty and students in the university-assisted community schools.

No overall evaluation has been conducted of the WEPIC program but reports from individual schools give evidence of progress. Charles Drew Elementary School showed more improvement on the state's standardized reading and math tests than any other school in the state in 1999, an increase of 420 points.[8] School-generated data from 1992-1997 show positive trends.

For Turner Middle School, the most "transformed" of the WEPIC models, average daily attendance improved from 86% to 89%, the promotion rate went up from 78% to 81%, parent involvement (percent of parents attending events) increased from 53% to 75%, and the number of students suspended decreased dramatically, from 302 to 102.[9] During this five-year period, the number of classes organized in collaboration with Penn increased from 4 to 19.

At Shaw Middle School, attendance increased and suspensions decreased. During the 1995-96 school year, reading proficiency improved significantly from the first report period to the third while failure rates tumbled.

Programs at Wilson and Drew Elementary schools work with school principals and teachers, linking resources of the America Reads initiative, Penn's Linguistics Department, and other faculty and university students.[10] The focus is on an after school reading program that attempts to address the "minority differential." An assessment of the program looked at 40 randomly selected subjects and matched control group in grades 2-5 who were behind in reading. The experimental group participated in an extended day program staffed by Penn work-study and volunteer America Reads students, high school students, and school staff members, resulting in a 1:3 tutor-student ratio. All of the subjects' reading scores increased by one grade level after 3.5 months enrollment (4 days a week for 1.5 hours). Most had caught up with their grade levels.

Two high schools, University City and West Philadelphia were among the five local high schools to receive awards of $100,000 for increases in attendance. The principal of University City, Florence Johnson, reports that the graduation rate has risen from 23% to 43% over a three-year period, an improvement attributed to the WEPIC involvement in the school.

Contact: JoAnn Weeks, Director of WEPIC, 215-898-0240, weeks@pobox.upenn.edu

Winburn Community Academy, Kentucky (WEPIC Adaptation)

Beginning in 1993, Winburn Middle School established a partnership with the University of Kentucky with support from the WEPIC replication project. The effort brought UK volunteer students to work as tutors in the after-school program and faculty to work on curriculum and training, opened the school to the community for education and recreation, and organized a summer program.

An analysis of the status of the school three years after the program started shows many positive changes.[11] The impact on the school has been substantial, with a new focus on service learning. Test scores have increased. The neighborhood is improved by having a safe place to go in the evenings. The program has been less successful in involving parents so far. According to the report, the project has had more influence on the institutions of the community than on individual citizens. The school system is planning two new community schools and the Mayor has created an Office of Community Schools.

Contact: Virgil Covington, Principal, 606-299-7711

Bloom Middle School, Cincinnati Ohio (WEPIC Adaptation)

Miami University developed a partnership with Lafayette Bloom Middle School supported by the WEPIC Replication Project. University faculty in conjunction with school staff created the CORE Academic Accelerated Program, structured summer school experience that addressed key elements in success in school.[12] They selected 21 very high-risk students to receive "wrap around" services and intensive one on one teaching. All the participants completed eighth grade requirements and were promoted to ninth grade. Almost all expressed an interest in going to college. However, when the students were interviewed a year later, they were once again failing. This research confirmed the importance of designing appropriate teaching strategies for high-risk youth and particularly, the importance of continuation of these interventions.

Contact: 513-357-4340

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Beacons

Originated in New York City in 1991 by the New York City Youth Bureau, community-based organizations are awarded grants to create school-based community centers that offer a wide range of recreation and social services, cultural and educational enrichment, and vocational activities that engage youth and involve families and the community. Each program is different depending on the characteristics of the provider agencies and the particular cultural and socioeconomic needs of the community. Many have health clinics and employment programs, others encourage family participation, arts, and recreation.

New York City currently supports 80 Beacons. An evaluation of the New York City program is being conducted jointly by the Academy for Educational Development (AED), Hunter College Center on AIDS, Drugs, and Community Health, and Chapin Hall Center for Children, University of Chicago. In its first phase, the evaluation focuses on implementation in 39 of the sites. In the second phase, an outcome study will be conducted in six sites.

An initial review of surveys of 7,406 participants found that the program attracts a wide range of ages from below 12 to over 21.[13] Many attend frequently and over a period of years. The participants reported that they felt the Beacons were a safe place, offered a wide range of interesting and engaging activities with concerned and experienced staff. More than three-fourths of the youth described the Beacons as helpful in preventing drug use and fighting and in encouraging schoolwork and leadership. Most Beacons offered homework help and educational enrichment programs. Adults in focus groups reported heavy use of adult activities, such as GED, ESL, volunteer jobs, and family support.

Contact: Linda Pitts, Fund for City of New York, Youth Development Institute, 212-925-6675, lpitts@fcny.org

Evaluation: Constancia Warren, AED, 212-243-1110, cwarren@aed.org

Bridges to Success

The United Way is assisting a school/community initiative, Bridges to Success (BTS), which was pioneered by the United Way of Indiana in Indianapolis.[14] The Institute for Educational Leadership is a partner at the national level. The purpose of the national BTS project is to promote the expansion of extended services schools in communities through the leadership of local United Ways. The goals are to enhance student performance and to build the self-sufficiency of families and communities. The model uses five key standards to facilitate success: governance; results and accountability; opportunities, services and support management; and finance

Indianapolis

The pilot BTS program brought the United Way of Central Indiana into a partnership with the Indianapolis Public Schools beginning in 1991. This effort created a partnership of ten major public and nonprofit agencies with a view toward integrating education with human and community service delivery systems and establishing schools as life-long learning centers and community hubs. The program has a two-tiered structure for governance. Under the auspices of a 28-member policy council, the program was implemented in 6 schools by neighborhood-based site teams with full-time site coordinators. At these demonstration schools, outside agencies provide health care, dental care, case management, recreational and cultural after-school activities, mental health services, community service learning, tutoring, and job readiness training. To fulfill the accountability goal, considerable effort has gone into evaluation of the Indiana BTS. The planning process was carefully documented to make sure that the 6 schools considered all the potential components.

An evaluation was conducted in 1995-96 of the school-based health and mental services provided through BTS.[15] Each school has a computerized database designed to capture demographics, presenting problems, contacts, progress notes, school attendance, and test scores. The report focuses primarily on utilization of services in each school. Data on primary health services were only available for some of the schools, but it appeared that large numbers of students were visiting clinics and receiving dental services. All schools had a full-time family services coordinator whose responsibility included case management for needy students and their families.

Some 202 students received case management services in the reporting year; for more than half the presenting problem was behavior issues. The median number of contacts per case was 20 with a range of 0-420 for students and 0-69 for parents and caretakers. The coordinators reported that 85% of the problems showed improvement following the intervention, mostly after 10 or less contacts. Among students who did not show improvement, the intensity of the intervention did not impact problem behaviors.

In 1997, BTS began to expand to 28 local "Covenant" schools, clustered around four high school areas. This experience is well documented.[16] Following an extended planning process, the services from many different agencies were brought into the schools, particularly health, mental health, youth development, tutoring and mentoring, recreation and culture. The report also gives details about how funds were leveraged from United Way, the school system, partner agencies, and foundations to support this broadened initiative.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Very little mention is made of outcome indicators. One chart is attached entitled "Academic Indicator Performance Reports-Pilot Schools." However, we are warned that direct comparisons between the most recent year (1997-98) and previous ones beginning in 1994 cannot be made because the test changed. Among the five schools reporting, all show decreases in teacher absence rate, suspension rate, and a slight increase in student attendance. The three elementary schools show a decline in the percent below state standards in English Grade 3 and Math Grade 3 (suggesting improvement). However, the percent below state standards in Grades 6 and 8 in the middle schools increased (scores declined).

Contact: Debbie Zipes, 317-923-1466, Zipes@uwci.org, URL:http://www.uwci.org

Hampton Year Round Elementary School, Greensboro, North Carolina

Hampton Elementary School (BTS Adaptation)[18] operates on a year-round calendar. It offers a full menu of services and supports through its Bridges to Success United Way Program. A full-time nurse arranges dental, health and vision screening and transportation to outside services. Many outside agencies contribute to school enrichment, after-school, and Saturday activities. A unique program is sponsored by the Greensboro Symphony to introduce 3rd graders to classical music and offer instruction.

The school reports that attendance rates have increased to 94% and that reading, writing and math proficiency for grades 3-5 went from 45% to 63% from 1997 to 1999. Parent participation has improved.

Contact: Josefa Bethel, United Way of Greater Greensboro, 336 378-6600

Extended Services Schools Initiative of Wallace Reader's Digest Foundation

The first four programs listed above are being evaluated as part of a foundation initiative to extend the hours of the school day and transform school buildings in low-income communities into neighborhood centers that offer both educational programs and a range of youth services. Some $13 million was awarded by the Wallace Readers-Digest Foundation to organizations in 17 communities to replicate these models in 60 school sites. A major evaluation is being conducted by a team of researchers from Public Private Ventures and the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation who are looking at 9 of the cities for in-depth studies of early implementation and planning and 5 cities for cost and participation studies. A management information system is being designed to collect data in the intensive sites.

Contact: Jean Grossman, Public Private Ventures, 215-557-4474

School of the 21st century

The School of the 21st Century (21C), a creation of Edward Zigler of the Bush Center for Child Development, Yale University, is a model for school-based child care and family support services to promote the development of children aged 0-12.[18] Core components include preschool child care, before, after-school and vacation care for school age children, information and referral services for families, training of child care providers, and guidance and support for new parents. This model has been implemented in more than 500 schools in 17 states since 1988. Connecticut and Kentucky have statewide initiatives to open Family Resource Centers in schools. Programs differ in schools; in some communities, 21C acts as the umbrella for coalitions of family support services, adult education, youth development and social services.

Many evaluations have been undertaken over the years.[19] According to the Bush Center, many benefits have been documented. Children in a 21C school who participated for at least three years had higher scores in math and reading than in a control non-21C school. Children who participated beginning at age three started kindergarten ready to learn. Parents who received 21C services were able to improve their child development practices, were less stressed, spent less money on child care, and missed fewer days work. Parents gave 21C schools high marks for academic focus, caring, and collaborative decision-making. Principals in 21C schools reported less vandalism, increased parental involvement, better teaching practices, and improved public relations with the community because of expanded services offered in the school.

Contact: Jennifer McGrady Heath, 203 432 9943

The school development program

The School Development Program (SDP), created by James Comer, Yale Child Study Center, and tested in the New Haven Schools in the early 1980s, mobilizes the whole "village" to help children grow. Specifically, SDP attempts to transfer mental health approaches to schools where "change agents" must be created by strengthening and redefining the

relationships between principals, teachers, support staff, parents, and students.[20] The formation of 3 teams is basic to the Social Development Program:

- School Planning and Management Team. Parents, teachers, administrators, support staff, and students develop a comprehensive plan and coordinate all school activities.
- Mental Health Team. School psychologists and other support personnel integrate and provide direct services to children, advise school staff and parents, and access resources in community.
- Parent Participation Team. Parents are hired to work in each classroom on a part-time basis and volunteer as teacher aides, librarians, run newsletters, and organize social activities.

A number of evaluations have been conducted. A summary of earlier studies conducted by both Comer and outside evaluators showed increases in student achievement in SDP schools compared to similar schools, higher averages in math and better grades in reading and math.[21] All of these schools were observed to have full implementation of the model, with access to a well-trained facilitator. A recent study of SDP in 10 sites, conducted by the Yale Child Study Center, showed that SDP had a positive impact on student behavior and achievement, especially at grades 3, 4, and 5.[22] An intensive study of the implementation of the Comer model in six elementary schools in Hartford, Connecticut was less encouraging.[23] Researchers Neufield and LaBue concluded that the process had not been adequately implemented. The SDP has made little difference to children in any of the schools and was unlikely to move forward in ways that might significantly benefit children without considerable restructuring of the effort at the central office, the schools, and between central office and the schools. James Comer and colleagues believe that the success of the SDP depends on a full-time program facilitator designated by the school superintendent to work in the district, one school at a time.

Contact: 203-737-1020

COZI (Comer-Zigler)

Combining 21C schools with the Comer model resulted in the CoZi model, now being developed in pilot communities. The merger of the two programs produces a focus on school-based, collaborative decision-making, parent and child outreach, universal access to quality child care, and parent involvement and literacy training. The Parents as Teachers approach to home visiting is incorporated in this approach, along with a health clinic and referral services.

Evaluation was conducted over the period 1996-1999 at the pilot site in Norfolk, Virginia, using surveys, interviews, and school records to compare the Bowling Park Elementary School with Oakwood, a comparison site with a slightly more advantaged population.[24] The effort was somewhat hampered by small, nonrandom samples, and low response rates. Nevertheless, researchers found that the CoZi initiative was positively associated with higher levels of academic achievement. Very young children at the intervention school in preschool and kindergarten, scored 9-15 points higher on picture-vocabulary tests than at the control school. For 3rd and 4th graders, the impact on basic skills was also significant. Bowling Park School outscored all schools in the school district with similar populations over the same three-year period.

Teachers reported a greatly improved school climate on such measures as decision-making, leadership, and staff dedication to student learning. The parents saw an improvement in caring and sensitivity, academic focus, and reported much higher levels of participation.

Further analysis of these results associated higher implementation of CoZi with improved school climate and innovative teacher communication strategies with parents, suggesting that CoZi has a strong impact on teachers' actions. For parents, those who had participated in the Parents as Teachers programs were more likely to engage in interactive behaviors with their children and more likely to participate in the classroom and the school.

Contact: Matia Finn-Stevenson, 203-432-9944

Communities in schools

Communities in Schools (formerly Cities in Schools) is a large national organization that works with local communities (businesses, social service agencies) as a broker to relocate social workers and other staff into schools so they can act as case managers and mentors. Founded in 1977, CIS leads a nationwide network of more than 150 independent local programs and 15 state offices. It is estimated that more than 1 million young people and their families are serviced through 1,500 school sites.

A national evaluation was conducted in the early 1990s by the Urban Institute tracking 659 students over time.[25] The research found that CIS programs served very high-risk youth. Contrary to expectations for those students, 80% were still in school or had graduated over three years. The cumulative dropout rate was 21 percent over 3 years or 7 percent annually, much lower than for similar students in other schools. CIS students with serious problems in attendance and

academic performance improved in those areas. About 70% of students with high absenteeism prior to participation in CIS improved their attendance and 60% with low grades improved.

Contact: Tom Wilson, Vice President, Strategic Alliance, 703-519-8999

Communities in Schools of Texas [26]

The state affiliate of CIS produces an annual publication of performance data, presumably collected from the 400 campuses served by the program. In 1998, CIS reported that 39,010 students received case management services and almost 200,000 other students were served. The "Stay in School Rate" was 95.9%, 84% of students improved their attendance, academics of behavior, and 85% of students graduated or obtained a GED. It is not clear from the summary whether the rates are for all students in those schools or for the students who received the case management services.

Contact: Tara Flowers, 512-821-4726

Communities In Schools of Miami, Inc. [27]

CIS of Miami is a non-profit organization providing stay-in-school services to approximately 2,200 students in 20 schools and one community agency (the NFL Youth Education Town Center). Three types of school-based programs are offered: corporate academies, in-school programs, and "comet" (elementary school) programs. Support services include case management, referral, mentoring, counseling, parent contacts, work-place tours, guest speakers, incentives, curriculum enhancements, and provision of supplies such as books and videos.

CIS of Miami conducts an annual evaluation. The most recent report (1998-1999) found that students at the corporate academies improved their Grade Point Averages (GPA) significantly when compared to the previous year. However, the objective to increase the GPA for at least 60% of the students was not met. Only 38% of students gained at least half a point over the first year of enrollment. About one-fourth of the students improved their attendance.

The objective at Miami Edison Middle and Senior High Schools is to support teachers' efforts to improve academic performance. More than 40% of the students obtained a grade of "C" or higher and more than one fourth improved their attendance.

The objective of the Comet Programs was to increase the GPA of 40% of students by at least one letter grade. No data are presented on this measure but the Comet students' performance on the Florida Writes test was very close to state performance standards, considered a plus for these high risk students. Some 45% of the students increased their attendance by 5% or more (mean days absent went from 9.40 to 8.85). A test of pre-employability skills showed significant increases in scores.

The evaluation included surveys of students and teachers on their perceptions about CIS. Most of the responses were positive, showing that students thought their teachers had high expectations for them and that CIS staff were very helpful in promoting success. Teachers and other school staff highly rated school-to-work programs and mentoring (but not tutoring).

Contact: Susan McCallion, Executive Director, 305-378-7380

Communities in Schools in Chicago

The extensive network of Communities in Schools in Chicago is undergoing close scrutiny by a research team from Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago. While no outcome data are available at this stage of the research, a report on the first year of review provides a detailed picture of how CIS operates in schools.[28] The researchers also offer a plan for evaluation in the future.

An Appendix provides a review of relevant literature, which covers many of the programs listed in this document (Comer, Healthy Start, New Jersey School Based, etc). Their research suggests that school climate can be improved through non-academic interventions, after-school recreation, school-family programs, and basic needs programs. "By providing resources to support schools, students, and families, efforts to connect schools to organizations that provide services may also improve the climate of the school. Through the increased, active support of individuals and organizations in the community, for example, teachers can develop a sense that they are not working alone in addressing issues facing their school and students. . . . [They] can focus their energy on instruction without having to direct energy toward addressing other student problems."

Wynn et al also find support in their research review for the idea that school/community partnership programs can reduce student problems, increase student engagement and attendance, and have some effects on academic achievement. They note that most of the improvement is experienced by the highest risk children.

Contact: Joan Wynn, University of Chicago, 773-753-5900

Stanley Elementary School, Wichita, Kansas [29]

Stanley Elementary School is open from 7am to midnight every day. This is a site for Communities in Schools as well as housing substations of the Departments of Health, Human Resources, Parks and Recreation, a branch library, and a senior service center. Some 23 repositioned personnel provide services to student and families on-site. Evenings and weekends, the school uses Vista Volunteers to help host college classes, community programs and recreation for adults. Partnerships with Washburn University and the Yamaha Corporation enhance the curriculum and many other volunteers provide extended day tutoring and mentoring.

The program reports that those students who were involved in CIS activities improved their reading scores by 21 percentile rank points from the previous year and 95% of students were promoted to the next grade.

Contact: Judy Frick, 316-733-7294

Communities in Schools of Passaic, New Jersey [30]

CIS initiated a program in 1994 at the William B. Cruise Elementary School with the goal of reducing the retention rate among kindergarten students (from 21% in the preceding year). Partnered with the United Passaic Organization, CIS provided after school tutoring to kindergarten students and a strong parent outreach and education component. After one year, the number of students retained in kindergarten was reduced by half and the remaining students were promoted for first grade after a summer academic program.

Based on the success of this program, CIS now serves students in three schools and the new Early Childhood Center. CIS operates a VISTA program recruiting parents to work in outreach.

Contact: Ella Strickland, 973-472-2478

State initiatives

California, Healthy Start

Beginning in 1991, Healthy Start grants were provided by the State Department of Education to local school systems and their collaborative partners to integrate child and family services. Grants are awarded to schools and their collaborative partners to create more child and family centered services systems, at or near school sites. The initiative is built around the premise that educational success, physical health, emotional support, and family strength are inseparable goals. A special emphasis is placed on improved school performance.

An early evaluation by SRI showed that student behavior, performance, and school climate improved in Healthy Start Schools. Families' unmet needs for basic goods and services were reduced by half, and children and families gained access to a broad array of services. Currently, there are about 400 grantees with almost 1,200 school sites. All grantees are required to submit an annual report of schoolwide data for each school as well as information on core clients. A recent evaluation (1997) based on 138 grantees showed the following:

- Test scores for schools in the lowest quartile improved substantially with reading scores for the lowest performing elementary schools increasing by 25% and math scores by 50%. Middle and high school students who were most in need improved their grade point averages by almost 50%.
- Student's health issues, especially preventive care, are being addressed where they previously ignored.
- Families reported improvement in filling basic needs such as housing, food and clothing, transportation, finances and employment.
- Students receiving Healthy Start services decreased their drug use.
- Family violence was decreased.[31]

Healthy Start's report features a number of statements from providers. John Nelson, the Principal of Vista Square Elementary School, Chula Vista, CA reported his school's approach to student monitoring. "We look at each and every child, every quarter, to find out their academic progress, their behavior progress, their social needs, and their emotional needs. . . we have meetings with each of the classroom teachers to discuss each and every child, we develop plans for those children identified at-risk. Those plans become the accountability for the staff to insure that we make referrals either to the Center, ...homework center, nurse contacts, Student Study Team contacts or to counseling. Then we follow up and monitor on a quarterly basis, so the individual plan becomes almost like a hospital chart for monitoring the progress of a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

patient. This…insures we are matching services to their needs. We are a low-income and a very high English-limited school…(yet) three of the four grades tested at grade level…Healthy Start is a major component in student achievement."

Contact: Lisa Villarreal, Director, California Community-School Partnerships/Healthy Start Field Office, 530-754-6343, lrvillarreal@ucdavis.edu

Evaluator: John Malloy, California Department of Education, 916 654 6446

Modesto (Healthy Start)

The school system in Modesto, California was one of the first recipients of Healthy Start grants. Beginning in 1992, Robertson Road Elementary School and Hanshaw Middle School used the grants to develop full service community schools. Modesto City Schools partnered with social services, health, mental health, drug and alcohol programs, the housing authority, police department and a non-profit community counseling agency. Hanshaw Middle School was organized into houses, each one tied to a university.

As of early 2000, Modesto had 5 Healthy Start sites. All sites provide mental health services and parent education services. Robertson and Hanshaw have full primary health care clinics and dental services. "Block House" parents go door-to-door to link their neighbors to resources at the school and in the community and provide case management for high-risk families. The Modesto City Schools have actively pursued funding for Family Learning Centers and After-School academic remediation and enrichment programs. (outcome data requested from state)

Contact: Pat Logan, Director Pupil Services, 209-576-4011

New Jersey School-Based Youth Services Program

The New Jersey School-Based Youth Services Program (SBYSP), developed by the New Jersey Department of Human Resources in 1987, was the first major state program that gave grants to community agencies to link education and human services, health, and employment systems. The "one-stop" program has been initiated by schools and community agency partners in 30 school districts (at least one in each county) and is about to be expanded to more. Each site offers a range of services including crisis intervention, counseling, health services, drug and alcohol abuse counseling, employment services, summer job development, and recreation. Some offer day care, teen parenting, vocational services, family planning, transportation, and hot lines.

In 1995, with support from the Annie Casey Foundation, the Academy for Educational Development began to conduct an evaluation of the state policy context of the program and of outcomes in six sites.[32] The research found that School Based services have been successfully integrated into the host schools. School Based staff participate in many school teams and committees, help with school events, conduct classes on high risk behaviors, advocate for special groups, and provide considerable counseling. Students in the six study sites were at very high risk for negative outcomes. SBYSP was successful at reaching those students at the highest risk. Statistically significant levels of positive change were observed in the following outcomes: educational aspiration, credits earned, psychological feelings, suicidal thoughts, use of condoms, smoking and drinking, and property damage. Educational benefits were less strong than psycho-social effects, suggesting that educational problems may need to be addressed more intensively by the schools.

Students appeared to "check out" the School Based staff prior to confiding in them. As one girl said "It's a lot easier to talk to the School Based people than to teachers because teachers gossip." SBYSP staff has built collaborative relationships that go beyond individual relationships to take on school wide issues such as tension between different ethnic groups and conflict between school cliques.

Contact: Barbara Knowlton, 609-292-7816

Evaluator: Constancia Warren, AED, 212-243-1110

Iowa School-Based Youth Services Program

Iowa's Department of Education supports the basic School-Based Youth Services Program which gives grants to school systems to bring services into schools. Goals are centered on the concept of "one-stop-shopping," family involvement, and successful youth development. It is an adaptation of the New Jersey SBYSP. A state coordinating committee oversees this program including representatives from 7 state departments, the state university, and the office of the attorney general. Currently operating in 27 sites, considerable effort has been given to evaluation including a computerized database beginning in 1991 with the inception of the program. A manual has recently been published that provides all of the instruments developed to assess this program along with the software needed to operate the system.[33]

The 1997-98 Year End Report of the School Based Youth Services Program provides the most recent data on the 18 sites in the system at that time.[34] Data on 15 measures are compiled from the database management system, school records,

interviews and surveys. Over 22,000 youth and families were being served, with 14% classified as educationally disabled. Case management, primary health, educational remediation, mental health, employment and training, and recreation were the most utilized services. Over one third of the students who participated in the SBYSP improved their grade point averages and one third improved their attendance at school. Sample surveys of students and parents showed positive assessments in regard to obtaining help, physical health, personal relationships, staying in school, and personal satisfaction.

Contact: James Veale, Consultant, 515-246-1275

Marshalltown Caring Connection (IOWA SBYSP adaptation)

The Marshalltown Caring Connection provides services at the high school as well as in six elementary and two middle schools, and one alternative high school. Some 13 state and local agencies provide resources including staff. At the Marshalltown High School, 20 different services are provided including mental health, family services, primary health care, service learning, and job training. A tutoring program works intensively with high-risk students in an Individual Assistance Center.

More than 1,000 students are served in this program every year. As a state grantee, this program uses the Iowa School-Based Youth Services record system. Evaluation data show a reduction in the dropout rate and evidence of attracting former dropouts back into the school system. Among students who were at high risk of dropping out, those who made more than 25 contacts during the year with Caring Connection had a dropout rate of 3 percent compared to 8 percent among those with few contacts.[35] A survey of students and parents showed very positive assessments of the program and the school, with 75 percent or more reporting better attendance and performance in school, reduction in use of substances, going on to college, not engaging in unprotected sex, and improved relationships with peers and family.

Contact: Marshalltown Community School District, 515-754-1130

Woodrow Wilson Middle School (Iowa SBYSP Adaptation)

At one time, Woodrow Wilson Middle School in Sioux City, Iowa, was characterized by low student achievement, high truancy and absence rates, numerous police citations, and a high rate of suspensions for vandalism, fighting, and insubordination.[36] As a result of Iowa's Department of Human Resources' goal to reduce the number of youths requiring residential treatment services, attention turned to enhancing local delinquency services and making them school-based. Over the past five years, a new kind of middle school has been shaped to fit the developmental and social needs of the students that relies heavily on site-based management and collaboration with local agencies to bring in an array of support people and services.[37]

Five innovative programs that rely on community partners have been introduced during the five-year period. The Outreach program brings minority counselors from a local community agency into the school setting where they are matched with high-risk minority students to provide intensive one-on-one attention. A police-liaison officer is stationed in the school to conduct gang-resistance training for seventh graders. The juvenile probation officer has an office in the school building allowing daily contact with adjudicated students. The probation officer also supervises the College Mentorship Program, which matches at-risk youth with supportive college students, and the Tracking Program, which follows adjudicated youth into the classroom to assure academic achievement. The After-School Program is administered by a local community social agency, providing homework help and tutoring, recreation, group work, and dinner, from 3 p.m. until 8:30 p.m. daily, including Saturdays.

Evidence of success includes substantial improvements in test scores, many more students on the honor roll, dramatically lower number of suspensions (the rate in 1995 was one-sixth the rate five years earlier), and attendance rates pushed up to nearly 95 percent. A reduction in court adjudication has also been reported. One observer noted, "a spirit of cooperation and a can-do attitude...with little or no evidence of that paralyzing social service disease, turfism, ...the school district staff and the (public) and private service agencies are willing and able to stretch their thinking and reconfigure their services...they can get their thinking and actions out of the traditional boxes."[38]

Contact: Peter Hathaway, Principal, 712-279-6682

Success Program, Des Moines Public Schools

The Success program of the Des Moines Public Schools provides school-based case management services, after-school programs, coordination of human services, and many other community resources. The program coordinates 11 different collaborative grant-funded projects with community agencies. It operates in 13 school buildings with a staff of 29 (mostly case managers) augmented with repositioned staff from 20 community agencies. For example, full-time mental health clinicians from the local Guidance Center see children in 7 elementary schools. The goal is to help children enter school ready to succeed and to stick with them through their school years so that they graduate. Seven sites have Family Resource Centers that offer case management, access to health and human services, and referral.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A report on the first five years of the program (1990-91 to 1994-95) documented a range of successful outcomes.[39] As a result of putting full time school nurses in school sites, 97% of the children were immunized. Dental screenings produced a 34% increase in improved oral hygiene and a 36% decrease in referrals for cavities. Targeted services to pregnant and parenting teens resulted in a 70% retention rate in the high school, compared to a 50% rate nationally. A follow-up survey of graduates who received case management services showed that 80% were either working or in school one year after graduation.

In 1998-99, 89% of pregnant teens at two high schools with special programs stayed in school compared to 70% in the previous period.[40] Among high school students who received case management, 36% improved their grade point average, and 54% improved their attendance. The immunization rate grew to 98%. Some 87% of parents of children served through the mental health partnership improved their performance in meeting the social, educational, and emotional needs of their children. Hundreds of children attended after-school and summer programs. The report contains many anecdotes about achieving program goals: e.g. a homeless child of a single unemployed mother was having difficulty getting to school. The mother was able to obtain housing, medical care, and transportation, resulting in improved attendance for the child.

Contact: Margaret Jensen Connet, Program Manager, 515-242-8117

Kentucky Youth and Family Centers

Kentucky's major school reform initiative in 1990 called for the development of family and youth service centers (FRYSC) in schools where more than 20 percent of the students are eligible for free school meals. By 2001, Kentucky will have 703 centers, servicing 1088 schools, approximately 93% of al those eligible. School systems are awarded grants by an Interagency Task Force of the Kentucky Cabinet for Human Resources. Grants are given to secondary schools for Youth Service Centers to set up a designated room with a full-time coordinator to oversee referrals to community agencies for health and social services and to provide on-site counseling related to employment, substance abuse, and mental health. The program also supports Family Resource Centers in elementary schools, offering parenting education, after-school child care, and referral for parents to infant and child care, health services, and other community organizations.

The REACH research organization tracked the development of the FRYSC over many years.[41] A computerized record system was made available to all grantees. Over 40,000 records were reviewed for 1994-1995 to determine the characteristics of participants and programs. Analysis of the initial efforts of 25 of the centers yielded a number of important points: the centrality of having a strong coordinator; existence of a supportive relationship with school and principal; ability to mobilize community resources; connecting with parents; and delivery of "wraparound services" on site rather than just referral. The researchers identified concerns about "mission drift," the tendency to move toward the provision of general services rather than targeting limited resources on those interventions that were most likely to impact on school performance. They also observed that centers were more likely to provide direct services to students rather than building up the capacity of their families and communities to meet those needs.

The most recent report shows pre/post intervention data for targeted children and youth in 20 randomly selected schools, based on a teacher rating scale: Classroom performance improved, but evidence of changes in achievement was only observed at the elementary level. Among secondary students, there was no change in academic performance that could be attributed to the presence of a Center, and attendance actually decreased over time. Teachers thought they had decreased the potential for dropout at the elementary level. Classroom judgments were more encouraging: both elementary and secondary level students demonstrated strong positive changes such as completing class work and homework, following directions and rules, and remaining on task. Students appeared to improve their social relationships across all levels of program involvement.

Kalafat et al sum up their findings that despite methodological limitations (which they describe in their papers), the research on FRYSC's appears to support the premise that school-linked family support initiatives may indirectly impact improving educational progress among high-risk youth. "It would appear that an important strategy…is to establish close working relationships with educators and to develop coordinated efforts to meet students' needs."

Contact: Sandy Goodlett, Executive Director, 502-564-4968, http://cfc.ky.us/frysc

Evaluator: REACH of Louisville, Inc., 502-585-1911, http://reachoflouisville.com/frysc

Missouri, Caring Communities

In 1989, four state department directors realized that their departments were all serving the same children and their families. They joined forces, pooled resources, and developed a pilot project in two school/neighborhood sites. Today, nearly 100 Caring Community sites are currently supported by the Missouri State government. Seven state departments are involved with a budget of $21.1 million. Caring Communities is a key feature of the Urban Education Policy of the state. The program is being implemented under Community Partnerships whose challenge is to develop school linked

services at the local level.

An evaluation conducted in 1998 by Philliber Associates found many positive results in 62 of the neighborhoods and schools with Caring Community grants.[42] The six goals of the program were reviewed. Instances of child abuse or neglect declined 15% between 1996 and 1998 compared to a 10% decline in other communities in the state. Students showed increases in math and reading scores. Dropout rates, grade retentions, and suspensions in schools declined as did teenage pregnancies. The number of preventable hospitalizations and out of home placements for mental health declined more than in other communities.

Contact: Steve Milburn, 314-531-5505

Jackson County Caring Community

The Caring Communities Initiative has been implemented in 16 school and neighborhood sites across four school districts in Jackson County (Kansas City area). The Local Investment Commission (LINC), a citizen-driven reform commission, surveyed the sites in 1998 about the impact of the program.[43] The report shows the changes in each school site for the six goals. In regard to changes in school success, most reported on high participation rates in educational enhancement and parent conferences.

Highlights from schools provide interesting insights. Chick and Proctor Schools reported an increase in both reading and math scores while James showed a marked decrease in suspensions. The Blenheim School reported a 40% decrease in disruptive behavioral incidents following the initiation of a system for referrals for clinical therapy. The Bryant school, with an intensive family intervention, increased volunteer hours from 43 in 1996 to 2,008 in 1998. Central High School dramatically reduced its failure rate by targeting suspended youth and inviting them to attend school at a local church setting where they can get tutoring, mental health services, and social skills training. Test scores improved significantly at McCoy School through the addition of before and after-school mentoring. Reading is emphasized in this school, abetted by large numbers of volunteer tutors. Parental attendance at school conferences has risen as well.

Contact: Brent Schondlemeyer, LINC, 816-889-5050, bschondl@kclinc.org

Walbridge (Original Caring Communities Site)

The Walbridge Elementary School in St. Louis began offering services in 1989 as the pilot site for Caring Communities. The program included both prevention and treatment efforts, in collaboration with a local mental health agency. An evaluation by Philliber Research Associates, conducted in 1994, showed that the Walbridge Caring Community was serving families with multiple needs in a high-risk neighborhood.[44] Parents reported an active role in school decision-making and saw the school as a valuable source of support. Although the families were no less likely to be involved with the social services or juvenile justice systems, the local police credited Caring Communities with being a potent force for crime reduction in the neighborhood. Only the children who received intensive services through case management improved their grades.

Contact: Steve Milburn, 314-531-5505

Washington, Readiness to Learn

Readiness to Learn (RTL) is an initiative created jointly by the Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Social and Health Services, Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development, Employment Security Department, members of the four legislative caucuses, and the Governor's Office. This program is overseen by a state office called the Family Policy Initiative.[45]

RTL was created by the state legislature in 1993 as part of an educational reform act providing $8 million to 31 local consortia to "link education and other human service providers to solve problems and improve service integration, service delivery, and education success." Services must be locally planned and coordinated, family-oriented, customer service-oriented, culturally relevant, creative, community-based, preventative, and outcome-oriented. Goals included improvement in school outcomes, reduction in truancy and student behavior problems. The program focuses on access to health services, safety at home and in the community, and access to work training or retraining.

The evaluation looked at systems changes through questionnaires, service utilization, and outcome data from child records, family records, and service logs. Each program was different: Yakima has early intervention, mentoring, K-3 health curriculum, counseling, case management, and family literacy skills; Pierce County services 16 schools with a family support worker.

Classroom teachers reported that attendance improved for students who had been originally referred for attendance problems. Participating students had 52 percent fewer days absent during the spring grading period compared to the prior year. Teachers observed fewer behavior problems among students who had been referred for inappropriate behavior.

Fewer office detentions were recorded among students referred for inappropriate behavior who had had previous referrals for detention. These same high-risk students also were less likely to be suspended after they were in the program.

Contact: Christine McElroy, 360-753-6760

Local Initiatives (Multiple Schools)

Boston Excels

The Boston Children's Services' Home for Little Wanderers is the lead agency working in collaboration with the Boston Public Schools and other agencies to operate Boston Excels, a community school model in five elementary schools (expected to add five more within five years). Supported by local foundations since 1991, this program's primary goal is to improve academic achievement in high-risk students through a long-term commitment to partnerships with schools. Donald McKay was the first school, followed in 1996 by two others. Each school has its own package of interventions including individual counseling, mentors, academic support, after-school programs, and the development of parent centers. The Efficacy Institute has trained both teachers and parents in values and skills related to enhancing the school climate. Each school has a full-time coordinator and senior level clinician along with social work interns from university partners.

Several evaluations have been conducted. The Educational Development Center did a major study of McKay, tracking changes from 1990-93.[46] The first report showed an increase in promotion (from 95% to 98%), increases in reading and math scores, teacher reports of improved classroom behavior and parent involvement.

A study in 1996-97 tracked the replication process in the two new schools.[47] According to the researcher, Sarah Uhl, the replication of Project Excel "exceeded expectations" and generated requests from other schools to begin the process. Looking

at the aggregate for the three schools where 1,916 students were enrolled, some 650 had received counseling, 417 families had received support services, 296 crisis intervention services were provided, and hundreds of parents were involved in an array of activities.

A program update in late 1997 reported that the Boston Children's Services worked with 44 public schools and community centers through their partnership with Family Services of Greater Boston, called Solutions for Children and Families.[48] This new arrangement would offer a team of professionals with the training and capacity to "transform schools into effective centers of learning." Project Excel would be the model for these transformations.

McKay's seven years of experience provides a laboratory for learning about this program. The report states that in the three previous years, reading scores had improved 200% and math scores 50%. Project Excel was singled out by the Harvard Center for Children's Health to receive an award for excellence. Teachers and parents believe that teaching and learning are improving. More than 100 parents are actively engaged in the school. Ellis and Lee schools are developing rapidly with the addition of fathers events, special education events, literacy activities for children and their families, improved teacher morale, improved behavior, and other gains. The reports cited here contain many anecdotal accounts of parent, teacher, and community satisfaction with the changes in the school climate attributed to the Excel program. All the schools have received accolades for these innovative programs. Project Excel is actively involved with the school system and other Boston groups to facilitate the wide dissemination of the model throughout the school system.

Contact: Nechama Katz, 617-927-0624, nkatz@thehome.org

Polk Brothers Foundation Community Schools, Chicago

The Polk Foundation in Chicago Full Service Schools Initiative is designed to improve the physical and psychological well-being of children in high risk communities. The three schools and their partners selected out of 65 applicants are Brentano Elementary/Logan Square Neighborhood Association, Marquette Elementary/ Metropolitan Family Services and Riis Elementary/Youth Guidance. The schools are open after-school and in the evening. Each has a different set of programs including parent involvement, recreation, school remediation, and tutoring. Each partnership was required to set up a governance body and to hire a full time coordinator to oversee the operations.

Samuel Whalen has conducted documentation and evaluation since the program began in 1997.[49] The evaluation is designed around tracking successes in four areas: increasing access to services, including a wide range of community stakeholders, improving the school climate, and creating a shared enterprise between the school staff and community service providers. The long-range goal is to improve academic achievement and psychological well-being of the children. These goals were translated into four specific forms of social capital that the partnerships expected to improve: sense of safety and security, places to socialize, availability of help for difficult problems, availability of adults to act as role models and mentors.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Surveys were conducted of students, parents, and teachers in 1997 and 1998, showing the changes that took place one year after the initiation of the program. As would be expected, only small changes were reported in test scores (all positive) although there was some evidence of improvement in the coverage of children by caring adults. Student mobility decreased 2-5% in the three schools suggesting that the initiative helped the school hold on to the students.

In 1999, the Chicago Public Schools in conjunction with Polk Bros. initiated three additional Comprehensive Community Schools, with partnerships between the public schools and three nonprofit organizations.

Contact: Samuel Whelan, Chapin Hall, University of Chicago, 773-256-5199

Dallas Public Schools

Dallas has an Office of Interagency Collaboration with three primary programs: Before and After School at 153 elementary schools; Homeless Youth Program; and Youth and Family Centers at 10 sites. The Centers are operated jointly by the school system, local hospital, and mental health agency.

The Dallas Public Schools conducted an evaluation of the Youth and Family Centers in 1997.[50] Implementation ranged significantly with marked differences between centers in staffing, space, and access. Students using the centers were generally poor and at high risk for dropping out of school. Reductions in discipline referrals, course failures, and absences were reported for students who received intensive mental health services, and reduction in absences for students who received other support services. However, most students using the Centers showed no significant gains in standardized test scores with the exception of those receiving intensive mental health services who showed gains in reading.

Contact: Jenny Jones, Dallas Public Schools, 972-925-3353

Montgomery County, Maryland, Linkages to Learning

Linkages to Learning was initiated in 1993 by the county government to provide services to students and their families to improve the students performance in the school, home and community. This is a collaboration between the Montgomery County Schools, County Department of Health and Human Services, and several private agencies. By 2000, the program was operating in nine elementary and secondary schools in the county. The program provides social, health, and mental health services and educational support through interagency collaborations.

A formative evaluation was conducted in 1995 by the College of Education, University of Maryland, to find out whether the program met the needs of its potential clients in the first three sites.[51] Families were very satisfied with the program. Staff reported that the demand for mental health services could not be met. In the early stages of the program, certain structural problems were identified, such as lack of central decision-making, duplication of bureaucratic efforts (multiple forms), no formal agreements on how agencies should interrelate, and lack of communication between school and agency staffs. This evaluation was used to strengthen the program by adding administrative support and getting more resources for mental health services.

With support from the U.S. Department of Education, an evaluation of Linkages was conducted at the Broad Acres Elementary School, using another school as a control over a three-year period.[52] Broad Acres serves 500 children K-5 from 40 countries, speaking 10 languages; 90% qualify for free and reduced meals. In addition to Linkages of Learning mental health, social services and education services, a health center was added to this site with support from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The report of the research carefully documents the evolution of the program over the three years from 1997 to the present, documenting changes in personnel, addition of components and partners, and moving to a permanent building along side the school. Analysis of utilization data for a cohort of K-2nd graders showed that 61% used Linkages services at some time.

The evaluation was designed to look at the achievement of 3 outreach and 8 direct service objectives. Many activities were reported that helped families and children deal with their problems. Access to health care was greatly increased, reducing the percent of families who reported no health care access for their children from 53% to 10%, and those with no insurance coverage from 38% to 10%. An outcome evaluation collected data on social/emotional and academic functioning over four years from Broad Acres and a (poorly) matched school. Some 119 children, 69 parents and a few teachers were included in the longitudinal sample, reflecting high loss from both schools because of mobility problems (in one year, 40% in the experimental school and 32% in the control). A detailed protocol made up of various research instruments was followed, requiring intensive interviews of respondents conducted by a cadre of university students.

The report contains detailed data analyses and graphs. Findings from the parents in the experimental school show a significant decrease in reported children's negative behaviors at the same time that such behaviors were reported by parents as increased in the control school. Children who had received direct services from Linkages (such as case management or counseling) showed the greatest improvement. Teachers had similar reactions about classroom behavior. The children in the experimental school reported no changes in their emotional distress levels while the children in the control school

reported significant increases.

In regard to academic outcomes, children at both schools had higher math achievement at the end of the study than at baseline. However, children who received educational services through the Linkages program improved significantly more than those at the experimental school who did not receive services. "While the children not receiving direct educational services started out with higher scores, by the end of the study, the children receiving services had made such gains that they were now approaching the scores of their peers in the no-service group." No positive impact was found for reading or writing, which may have been attributed to the significant number of children in the experimental school who had limited English proficiency.

Parents at the experimental schools reported being relatively less depressed over time, reported an increase in family cohesion, and demonstrated greater gains in consistency in parenting styles. The data suggest that those children and families who used Linkages services showed significant improvements in outcomes, not experienced by those in the experimental school who did not utilize the services. The program had an effect on the individuals, but not necessarily on the total school climate.

Contact: Nathan Fox, 301-405-2816; Peter Leone, 301-405-6489, University of Maryland

SUN Schools Uniting Neighborhoods Initiative, Multnomah County, Oregon

The Portland area has a lot of experience with different aspects of community schools. The school system and the parks and recreation department have had a partnership for 20 years to provide recreational activities. The county health department has sponsored many school-based clinics. In 1999, representatives of school and community groups came together to form Schools Uniting Neighborhoods (SUN) with a goal of creating community-centered schools.[53] Eight schools were selected for the first round of funding and they in turn contracted with community agencies to provide a range of services.

SUN has three integrated goals: educational success, access to health and social services, and provision of recreational and educational programs in an extended day. An evaluation is being conducted under the leadership of the Multnomah County budget office. A system is being designed to capture outcome data as well as to track and document implementation over time.

One of the schools in this program, Lane Middle School, in a disadvantaged neighborhood in South Portland, began the transformation to a full service school several years ago. It currently offers before and after school programs supported by businesses, foundations, nonprofit groups and volunteers. Metropolitan Family Service acts as a lead agency for 37 programs including the Bureau of Parks and Recreation. A health center is operated by the county. The building is open all year round from 8 a.m. to 9 p.m. Reports from the school show promise.[54] Attendance has increased from 85% to 91% over two years, and suspensions have declined from 50 to 15.

Contact: Michael Harris, Project Director, 503-988-3010, ext. 28561, www.co.multnomah.or.us/dcfs/sunschools/

Thomas E. Edison Community Middle School, Port Chester, New York

In the 1999 federal budget, Congressperson Nita Lowy sponsored legislation that brought $500,000 to Port Chester, New York to develop community schools[55]. Three other school systems received comparable awards. Part of the grant went to the Edison School which was well on the way to becoming a fully-realized community school. A full-time coordinator was hired. The new funds allowed the school to expand health services, adult and parent education, extended day programs, and computer literacy. Case management is staffed by the Westchester Guidance Center, which also works with the United Hospital to provide mental health services on site. The after school program is a partnership with the Port Chester Arts Council and the Even Start Family Literacy Program. An on-site family resource center is being set up that offers workshops, seminars, and computer and job readiness training. Additional adult education and child care is available through the Bureau of Cooperative Educational Services. Home Run Summer Enrichment Program is conducted in partnership with Manhattan College for grades 2-4.

Since the inception of the program, performance levels in English have risen significantly. Levels 3 and 4 (highest performance) increased from 20 to 61 percentile while levels 1 and 2 decreased from 80 to 39 percentile.

Contact: Eileen Santiago, Principal, 914-934-7981, esantiago@pcschools.lhric.org

Rochester change collaborative

This Collaborative is a coalition of the Rochester School System, United Way, Youth Bureau, City of Rochester, and Monroe County. It was originally organized by the United Way and is now administered by the Youth Bureau. The goal is to coordinate service systems and provide integrated programs in schools. Some 10 schools are involved: 4 middle schools have Wellness Centers, 1 middle school and 5 high schools have student support services.

An evaluation has recently been conducted by the Rochester Primary Health Project[56] of the four middle school Wellness/Community Centers, described as "Full Service Schools." The sites have a uniform data tracking system designed to provide the necessary information for tracking outcomes. Three of the sites are in the early stages of development, while one, Jefferson, has been open for six years. The report focuses on Counseling and Case Management, and Youth Development activities (before and after school recreation programs).

The evaluation showed that for those students referred specifically for suspension related issues, rates of suspension were reduced dramatically, but not among students referred for other reasons. Students participating in Youth Development activities reported feeling more of a sense of adult support and higher participation in pro-social activities than non-participants.

The researchers emphasized the preliminary nature of this report, and the difficulties encountered in comparing programs and populations that were so totally different in each school. They recommended that if academic achievement is a priority outcome, counseling and other services should be linked more directly with academic remediation, tutoring, and homework help. They also recommended more involvement by the school principals and more interaction between school personnel and service providers.

Contact: Joe Martino, Chris Dandino, 716-428-4944

St. Louis community education initiative

The St. Louis Community Education Initiative is modeled after the pioneer in Flint, Michigan.[57] The St. Louis School System embraced the model in 1968, with programs geared toward educational enrichment and recreation for the entire community. Over the years many changes have taken place although the program remains school-based and supported by school district and city funds. Currently, 16 community schools are being operated. In 1994, after a review of the program, a Community Education Review Panel recommended that the sites be reconstituted into comprehensive one-stop centers for community education with expanded programs. The City furthered the partnership by placing Neighborhood Stabilization Officers at each cite to establish a more permanent link between community education and neighborhood development.

During the period of 1995-99, expectations about the community education program shifted more toward student achievement, and the integration of after-school programming with classroom curriculum. Annual evaluations were conducted by Everett Nance and colleagues at the University of Missouri St. Louis. The first two years focused on programs and implementation. In the third year, the researchers began to look at integration and impact, comparing 15 non-community education sites to a similar number of community education centers to determine if there were significant differences in achievement scores. The evaluation revealed that there were no differences.

The fourth year evaluation was not initially focused on achievement outcomes. However, with the advent of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Initiative (CCLC), the focus changed. Five of the Community Education sites received CCLC grants (seven grants altogether in St. Louis) for after-school programs. An evaluation was conducted for the 1998-99 school year, during the first year of the new grants.[58] The program was reported to be well implemented, with program activities coordinated with school and community services. Individual site reports review classroom observations, interviews and surveys of teachers, administrators and parents, interviews with AmeriCorps members, and student data on behavioral infractions and motivation. These observations would be useful to each site, in order to review the progress of the program. Pre-post test scores in math for students in Grades 4-8 were analyzed, comparing regular students with those who participated in the after-school program. Statistically significant differences were found with the participants scoring higher. However, the researchers called for caution in inferring causality because of non-random assignment, not controlling for cognitive ability, small sample sizes.

The fourth-year evaluation report also focused on the community education center advisory councils, a unique aspect of St. Louis's community education program. The report documented that many adults and students were enrolled at the centers where they were offered a wide range of classes: vocational, arts/crafts/hobbies, general basic education, college, recreation/fitness, home/family, and special events. Some Centers reported as many as 20 different classes while no programs were offered in five of the sites during the spring period of 1999. The report includes "Success Stories," exemplary programs from different sites. For example, several sites had an Action Team made up of local services providers who met frequently to review current neighborhood resources and problems. This communication led to the development of many neighborhood projects. One school provided anecdotal information that better integration with an after-school tutoring program appeared to lead to better grades and homework completion.

Contact: John H. Windom, 314-773-7962, Charvey@Dtd1.Slps.K12.Mo.Us

Evaluator: Everett Nance, 314-516-5880

Achievement Plus Wilder Foundation, Saint Paul, Minnesota

A collaborative of state, city, county, school district and Wilder Foundation, full service community school programs are offered in two existing schools (Dayton Bluffs and Monroe), and one new school is currently being built. The primary goal is student achievement. Schools are expected to provide a fully integrated set of academic, family, health, social, and recreational support services to children families and community during school day and evenings, weekends and summer. This program is modeled after the Children's Aid Society with the Wilder Foundation acting as the lead agency. The program was initiated in 1997.

During the first two years of this initiative, personnel changes occurred on every level: superintendent of schools, principals, program director, coordinators, foundation, city, and county. These changes slowed the pace of implementation of the program.

An intensive evaluation process has been undertaken, facilitated by Cheryl Lange. An Advisory Committee has met regularly for several years, spending considerable time mapping out the desired outcomes and the methodology needed to collect those data. During the 1997-98 school year, extensive baseline data were collected at the two schools and at two matching comparison schools. *Report Card* is a unique publication of Achievement Plus. In June 1999, it reported that within two years, the program had established classes before and after school for hundreds of students. "Whether in art, music, science, or computers, the classes stress the development of either math or language skills." The classes reinforce the school-day curriculum. Family involvement in education increased through the use of the Family Resource Rooms. Families participated in learning activities, leadership roles, making home visits to other parents, and obtaining information about housing, jobs, welfare to work, and medical referrals.

The September 1999 *Report Card* reported that students at Daytons Bluff with high participation (75% or more) in extended day classes, improved their test scores while the scores of those with low participation went down. Participation in extended school activities increased from 12% of students in 1998 to 30% in 1999.

In 1999, the project also issued a series of "Evaluation Highlights."[59] In regard to school attendance rates, goals were not met for increasing rates. Participation in the extended day programs was also below the expected level (50%) in both schools. Achievement Plus appears to be an example of an initiative in which the evaluation provides ongoing feedback to the program.

A recent paper by Dan Mueller, Wilder Foundation, and Cheryl Lange, evaluator, explored the factors that might explain why test scores of students in the extended day programs did not improve more.[60] Due to high rates of student mobility, few students were frequent participants and thus lacked continuity. The after-school program was not well integrated with the classroom curriculum. Concern was expressed about teacher "burn out" in after-school classes after teaching a full day in the same school. These factors are being taken into consideration in redesigning the program.

Contact: Dan Mueller, Wilder Foundation, 651-647-4623

Evaluation: Cheryl Lange, 612-944-1113

San Diego Community School Innovations

City Heights Community School Innovations was a project supported by Sol Price, a San Diego businessman. The goal was to change the whole environment of City Heights, a community of some 85,000 people who speak 46 different languages. Price supported the building of a new community center, police station, swimming pool, and library in the center of the area. Two new schools were the center of this initiative: Monroe Clark Middle School (cost $26 million) and Rosa Parks Elementary School. Clark offered an extended day program, extending the normal seven period school day to nine periods. Academic and physical activity classes were taught by school employees and outside contractors. The program also worked to involve parents and other volunteers. A family resource room was available to the parents.

Thomas Herman, San Diego State University, conducted an evaluation of the extended day program at the close of the first year of operation.[61] He found that about one third of the students were involved, representing a very diverse population, ranging from very low achievers to very high achievers. Teachers and staff were excited about the program and saw it as having high potential for improving the learning culture of the school. Parents viewed the program as an opportunity for their children to improve their schoolwork. From the qualitative evidence, the program appeared to be influencing school pride, conduct, and academic performance.

At the end of the second year of Community School Innovations, the entire project was transferred from the foundation to the San Diego State University. The extended day program continues, although the schools have been reconstituted as charter schools.

Contact: Thomas Herman, 619-594-2776

Clearpool Network, New York

A private non-profit organization operates three schools, The Decatur-Clearpool School, The Jonas Bronck-Clearpool School, and the Carmel Residential Educational Facility, in New York City that function year round on two campuses (one urban, one rural) and incorporate a comprehensive network of social services. Clearpool's mission is to provide leadership in educational reform by creating a network of enduring child-centered and family-based environments. Many partners have been involved including the Social Development Program at Yale, the Annenberg School initiative, Beacons, and local youth and health agencies.

A 1998 study of the Decatur-Clearpool School and the Jonas Bronck-Clearpool School shows improvement in reading and math among students from 1996-97 and 1997-98 at a greater rate than other schools in the district in which they were located.[62] The study also revealed that students having more years of Extended Day programs performed better than those students with fewer years. The percentage of students at or above grade level in reading was 13 points higher than non-Extended Day students (but no differences were shown for math achievement).

Contact: 212-528-3193

Schools as the center of the community, grand forks, North Dakota

Schools as the Center of the Community is an initiative of the Knight Foundation being replicated in Grand Forks, North Dakota.[63] A social worker, counselor , and nurse are placed in school buildings that previously had no such available services. This program expanded from one site, Lake Aggasiz, to six schools through a PreK-16 Partnership Council with representatives from 15 local agencies, the local university, and the Knight Foundation.

An evaluation is being conducted by John Hoover, University of North Dakota, that uses various techniques (surveys, interviews, focus groups, collection of anecdotes, school data) to track the impacts of the program at Lake Agassiz and the other sites. Teachers were asked in 1998 and 1999 to identify the percent of students experiencing problems within the past 30 days that inhibited learning. Marked decreases were shown for behavioral problems and tardiness, improvements attributed to the intervention. The researchers collected 'stories" from the social workers and counselors that appeared to demonstrate that their daily presence in the schools made it possible to improve the teaching and learning environment.

Contact: John Hoover, University of North Dakota, 701-777-2513

Local initiatives (individual schools)

Molly stark elementary school, Bennington, Vermont

Molly Stark is one of the most comprehensive full service community schools around the country. The principal, Sue Maguire, has been the "lead agency" in bringing in many community agencies to help keep the school open extended hours - after school and summer - and to bring in child and family services. The crowning achievement was the opening of a state-funded Family Center with a pre-school and licensed day-care center. On site family outreach workers teach parents.[64] A pediatrician, psychologist and dentist are available to the students and their siblings. The local community college teaches on-site basic adult education. Big Brother Big Sister operates a mentoring program on site. About 40 different activities have been built into the school to enhance learning and involve families.

A formal evaluation is beginning conducted under the auspices of the Harvard Collaborative for Integrated School Services. Maguire has reported early signs of success of the programs including: increases in reading scores, declining absenteeism, decline in physical and verbal aggression, and huge increases in parental involvement in the school.

Contact: Sue Maguire, Principal, 802-442-2692

Flambeau School, Tony, Wisconsin[65]

This K-12 rural school exemplifies a comprehensive Community Education program. For 15 years, various educational programs have been offered to families from the area for enrichment and educational enhancement. Recently, Flambeau students in grades 5-8 were offered the Youth Connections program funded through a 21st Century Community Learning Center grant featuring experiential learning, tutoring, and parent education. The program reports that participants made a gain of 55% in school attendance, a 50% increase in grades, and 60% decrease in disciplinary referrals.

Contact: Chuck Ericksen, New Paradigm Partners, 715-986-2020

Elizabeth Learning Center, Cudahy, Los Angeles

According to Howard Adelman and colleagues, the Elizabeth Learning Center represents a "break the mold" school reform initiative.[56] This innovative program involved the joint efforts of the school staff, LA school system, the teacher's

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

union, community partners, as well as the New American Schools Development Corporation and the district's reform movement (LEARN). The school was restructured around three key components: shared governance, innovative curriculum and instruction, and comprehensive student and family support. The campus includes a Family Center, Primary Health Care Clinic, a childcare cooperative run by parents, an after-school program and extensive adult education. The Learning Support Component has six program areas that focus on eliminating barriers to learning.

According to a report from UCLA, test results for 1997 and 98 showed increases in reading and math scores for almost every grade level (all but two grades).[67] Increases were greatest in the primary grades. Elizabeth Street demonstrated low drop out rates, strong grade point averages and high attendance. All of the seniors graduated on time. Parental presence in the school increased most dramatically, with more than 1,000 parents and other adults attending adult education classes weekly.

Education Week ran a major story on the school's nurturing atmosphere.[68] Jessica Portner concluded, "No sure statistical barometers measure how the school climate has changed since the new organization was first adopted, but some data have been encouraging. Student suspensions...are down. Besides feeling safer, students are less apt to be self-destructive than their counterparts in other schools. Neighboring Bell High School averages two suicide attempts per week. In the five years since the Elizabeth Learning Center opened, not a single student has taken his or her life. . . . Test scores have inched up (from the 16th to the 20th percentile). The dropout rate hovers near 2 percent and the graduation rate - at 95 % - is double that of the neighboring schools. More than 76% of students take the SAT."

Contact: Howard Adelman, UCLA School Mental Health Project, 310-825-3634

http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu

After-school programs

National

Foundations, Inc

A private non-profit community service organization started in 1992 provides comprehensive before and after-school cultural and educational enrichment programs in 22 urban sites, mostly schools. A preliminary evaluation conducted in 1998 by the Rand Corporation looked at programs at six elementary schools and their short term (four month) impact on reading and math.[69] This program includes a curriculum emphasizing academic subjects as well as experience designed to foster physical and emotional health. Students are taken on field trips, helped with homework, and exposed to computers. Compared to non-participants, 4th grade students who were exposed to the Foundations program improved significantly in reading and language arts. Students in grades 1, 2, and 3 (for whom there were no comparison groups) also showed large gains in scores but not 5th graders. Large differences were found between the schools, with one school showing substantial improvement and another showing very low levels. The researchers point out that the short time frame and the lack of an adequate comparison group limit the validity of this research.

Contact: Rhonda Lauer, 609-727-8000

Local

Austin, Texas After-School Recreation Programs

Beginning in 1992, Austin school system, Austin Parks and Recreation Department, and Austin Interfaith collaborated with Austin City Council to fund and operate after-school programs in low-income communities. During the 1994-95 school year, when the program was expanded to 20 schools, Dwayne Baker and Peter Witt conducted an evaluation in two of the sites for grades 3 - 6.[70] Participants were compared with non-participants, and by number of activities pursued. Participants, especially those who were involved in high numbers of activities, had higher test scores for math, science and reading than non-participants. No significant impact was found on behavioral measures or self-esteem, probably reflecting the academic focus of the program.

Contact: Texas Interfaith Education Fund, 512-459-6651

Chicago lighthouse program[71]

The Chicago Board of Education supports a system wide after-school tutoring and homework program. Teachers supervise classes of 15 students. Following one hour of intensive instruction, students get one hour of recreation and a meal. In 1998-99, 314 schools participated. This program is targeted toward failing students, to prevent grade retention.

The most significant achievements of the program have been improved scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Of the original 40 schools (1996-97), 39 showed increased reading scores and 30 increased math scores. Of the 248 schools in 1997-98, 205 showed increases in reading and 194 increases in math. 23 schools that were on probation (below 15% level in reading) were taken off as a result of improvements shown in this program.

Contact: 773-553-2150

Ohio urban school initiative school age care project (SACC)

In Ohio, 17 urban school districts have been funded by the Ohio Department of Human Services to develop childcare programs at 125 centers in conjunction with local agencies. An evaluation conducted by the University of Cincinnati found the following:[72]

4th and 6th graders in SACC programs scored higher than students in other schools on proficiency tests in all subjects but science. The most significant gains were in reading. School absences and tardiness were reduced for participating students and they were more likely to turn in homework, according to teachers and parents. Suspensions and expulsions were reduced. Participants spent more hours in safe, supervised environments. Parents reported better access to their jobs as a result of affordable childcare. The provision of food was an important magnet in drawing children to the program.

Contact: William Dolan, Ohio Hunger Task Force, 614-341-7700, dolan@ohtf.org

LA's best after school program, Los Angeles, California

Implemented in 1988, LA's Best, a non-profit agency, is jointly supported by city, school, and community agencies. The K-6 program is now in about 22 schools. An evaluation was conducted for the period of 1992-94 at 10 of the then operating 19 sites.[73] Children who had participated for two or more years were compared with non-program children from the same schools. Although program children started out behind others, after two years of participating in LA's Best, they "caught up" with the others. For a smaller group, the program children had higher grade point averages after participation. Participants reported expanded social resources, greater feelings of safety, higher expectations, and greater motivation and enthusiasm for school. Homework help appeared to be a major factor in success along with the safe and supportive environment. A long-term impact study is currently underway.

Contact: Carla Sanger, 213-847-3681

The after-school corporation initiative (TASC) open society institute, New York City

After-school programs 5 days 3-6 at about 84 sites in New York City and area

An evaluation is being conducted by the Policy Studies Associates. Preliminary findings suggest that the participating students reflect the school populations in which the programs are located. They had slightly higher performance and attendance records than non-participants. Students in projects with high attendance rates reported that they were more likely to finish their homework, feel safe after school, and learn to use English. Parents were helped to work more hours because of this access to child care.

Contact: Lucy Friedman, 212-547-6955

Virtual Y, New York City

The YMCA of Greater New York initiated an after-school program in 66 elementary schools for children in grades 2-4. Programs, staffed largely by youth workers, were limited in size to 50 children.

The National Center for Schools and Communities at Fordham University was contracted by the YMCA to conduct a 3-year evaluation, beginning in the 1997-98 school year, looking at needs, implementation, behavioral outcomes, and academic outcomes. The 1997-98 report on behavioral outcomes was based on a survey of the participants' public school teachers.[74] Prior to participation, nearly 85% of the children served in the program evidenced some behavioral problem (scales measuring 8 factors such as motivation, learning skills, acting out, social skills, etc.). Post-tests (surveys of teachers) showed statistically significant improvement in the reported behavior of participating children on all eight scales. The researchers found a strong relationship between the quality of the Y programs and the extent of child-level improvements.

To evaluate the impact of the program on student performance, the Virtual Y participants were compared to comparison group children in other program sites.[75] Because of difficulty tracking attendance records, findings were limited. Virtual Y children appeared to have slightly higher school attendance, but not significantly so; not much difference in reading scores, and somewhat higher math scores. The researchers summarized their findings, pointing out the very small sample

size of groups, but noting the pattern of results: of 17 statistical tests, Virtual Y children out-performed the children in comparison groups, but only 8 of the tests showed statistically significant results.

Contact: Jill Karp, 212-630-9629, jkarp@ymcanyc.org,

http://www.ymcanyc.org/programs/index.html

Back <<< >>> Home